



[Majority Press Releases](#)

[Fact of the Day](#)

[Speeches](#)

FRIDAY, JULY 15, 2005

# THE WEEKLY CLOSER

FROM THE SENATE ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE  
MAJORITY PRESS OFFICE

VOLUME 1, NUMBER 5

## THE WEEK IN REVIEW...

- [Inhofe Says CAIR Lawsuit Demonstrates Need For Clear Skies Law](#)
- [Bipartisan Water Infrastructure Bill Introduced](#)
- [A Climate Change Triple Play To End The Game?](#)
- [Inhofe Praises President Bush's Intention To Nominate H. Dale Hall As U.S. Fish And Wildlife Service Director](#)
- [EPA Nominations Hearing](#)

## IN THE NEWS...

- [Split court upholds EPA decision not to regulate greenhouse gases \(Greenwire, July 15, 2005\)](#)

## IN CASE YOU MISSED IT...

- [Bush's unheralded energy triumph \(column by Robert D. Novak, July 14, 2005\)](#)

## QUOTES OF THE WEEK...

1999:

"We will hear a lot of rhetoric about how much implementing mercury reduction steps will cost. In advance of those complaints I want to make two points. First, when we were debating controls for acid rain we heard a lot about the enormous cost of eliminating sulphur dioxide. But what we learned from the acid rain program is that when you give industry a financial incentive to clean up its act, they will find the cheapest way. ... Secondly, and most importantly, the bottom line here should not be the cost of controlling mercury emissions, but the cost of not controlling mercury."

Senator Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.)  
Sponsor of S. J. Res. 20, Disapproving EPA's Clean Air Mercury Rule  
Congressional Record  
March 19, 1999

2005:

"The cap-and-trade system established under today's rule also creates incentives for continued development and testing of promising mercury control technologies that are efficient and effective, and that could later be used in other parts of the world. In addition, by making mercury emissions a tradable commodity, the system provides a strong motivation for some utilities to make early emission reductions and for continuous improvements in control technologies."

EPA Press Release  
Implementation of the Clean Air Mercury Rule  
March 15, 2005

## INHOFE SAYS CAIR LAWSUIT DEMONSTRATES NEED FOR CLEAR SKIES LAW

Sen. Inhofe said Tuesday that a lawsuit filed last week against the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) by North Carolina's

Democrat attorney general, the Appalachian Mountain Club, Group Against Smog and Pollution, the National Parks Conservation Association and Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), is nothing more than the latest political move that will actually delay clean air progress. CAIR is intended to reduce air pollution from power plants in 28 Northeastern states and the District of Columbia.

“Time and again, these extreme special interests and their Democrat allies seem to be more focused on issuing political statements than improving our air quality,” Senator Inhofe said. “This latest round of litigation demonstrates the need for a strong national Clear Skies law more than ever. Trying to litigate the way to cleaner air only delays progress, often yields little or no result and wastes millions in taxpayer dollars. Our Clear Skies legislation would actually do far more to help state and local governments comply with the new air quality standards than the rule would. If these groups and their friends in Congress are serious about reducing air pollution, I welcome their endorsement of Clear Skies and its 70 percent cut in air pollution from the power plants nationwide. We have a workable proposal on the table, and given the rejection of mandatory caps on carbon dioxide by 60 senators and the recent failure of three key air-related lawsuits, there is no reason for my Democrat colleagues to continue their objections and obstructions. We should be able to go home this summer and tell our constituents that their air is going to become 70 percent healthier. I am still waiting for the opponents of Clear Skies to come to the table with a legislative counter offer to the multiple proposals Senator Voinovich and I have offered the Committee.”

[Return to the top](#) 

## ***BIPARTISAN WATER INFRASTRUCTURE BILL INTRODUCED***

Sen. Inhofe, along with Sen. James Jeffords (I-Vt.), ranking member of the full committee, Sen. Lincoln Chafee (R-R.I.), chairman of the subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Water, and Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton (D-N.Y.), ranking member of the subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Water, yesterday introduced the “Water Infrastructure Financing Act,” which will provide \$38 billion over five years to our nation’s cities and municipalities to address aging water infrastructure and provide clean, healthy, safe, and secure water. The legislation updates and improves upon the Clean Water and Safe Drinking Water Revolving Loan Funds, provides targeted grant assistance, and includes incentives for innovative and non-traditional approaches to address water pollution.

Senators Inhofe, Jeffords, Chafee and Clinton released the following statements:

### **Sen. Inhofe, chairman of the EPW Committee**

“The federal government has imposed numerous expensive regulations on our cities and towns without providing sufficient funding to meet our obligations under the

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. I am pleased to be joined by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in offering bipartisan legislation to address the well-documented funding gap between what we as a nation currently spend and what we need to spend to meet these regulatory mandates and update aging infrastructure. The nation is on the verge of a crisis with its water and wastewater systems and action must be taken now.”

**Sen. Jeffords, ranking member of the EPW Committee**

“I am pleased with the bipartisan legislation we are introducing today to address our nation’s water infrastructure needs. This bill represents a new awareness on the part of the federal government that our nation’s water supply is becoming an increasingly precious resource. With this legislation we renew our commitment to the water systems of the nation and help states and local communities provide clean and safe water for our citizens for years to come.”

**Sen. Chafee, chairman of the EPW Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Water**

“I am pleased to be introducing the bipartisan Water Infrastructure Financing Act with Chairman Inhofe and Senators Jeffords and Clinton. As our communities struggle to meet the rising costs of delivering clean, safe drinking water and wastewater services through aging delivery systems, this legislation will provide critical new authorized funding for water infrastructure. Further, the bill contains important new grant components for addressing today’s more complex water issues, as well as resources for improving the health of watersheds, and reducing stormwater and combined sewer overflows entering waterbodies such as Narragansett Bay. I look forward to swift passage of this vital legislative package.”

**Sen. Clinton, ranking member of the EPW Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Water**

“We know that the projected costs of water infrastructure will outstrip currently available funding sources by billions of dollars over the next twenty years. This bipartisan legislation will provide new funding to our cities and towns to help them clean up their lakes and streams and provide safe drinking water.”

[Return to the top](#) 

## ***A CLIMATE CHANGE TRIPLE PLAY TO END THE GAME?***

### **MVPs: House of Lords, G-8 Leaders, DC Circuit Court**

In what could be called a triple play on climate change, the British House of Lords, G-8 Leaders, and the D.C. U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals made quick work of the failed approach by alarmists on climate change. These recent developments are the

latest in a string of debilitating defeats against mandatory carbon caps and the Kyoto Protocol that should put alarmists and their liberal special interest allies on the disabled list - permanently.

Today, the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia dismissed a lawsuit that sought to force the Bush Administration to issue mandatory controls for carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions from new cars and trucks. Yet again the litigation strategy of Democrats and their liberal special interest allies, while costing taxpayers, has failed.

Last week, the G-8 leaders, in their communiqué, supported the position of the Bush Administration and clearly moved away from any future Kyoto-like agreement. Their statement represented a key repudiation of the flawed treaty and its mandatory carbon caps, but importantly, also signaled their consensus that there are scientific uncertainties related to climate change: "While uncertainties remain in our understanding of climate science, we know enough to act now to put ourselves on a path to slow and, as the science justifies, stop and then reverse the growth of greenhouse gases."

Also last week, the British House of Lords' Economic Affairs Committee released its report, "*The Economics of Climate Change*," confirming the numerous uncertainties in climate change science and the problems associated with the work of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and problems with the Kyoto Protocol. They write:

- "The Kyoto Protocol is essentially a legal regime that attempts to punish short-term non-compliance but ... does so with an enforcement mechanism that is so weak it is likely to be counter-productive, i.e. it will encourage reduced participation in the future, not the widening participation that is required. At the moment, it is hard to see how countries will sign up to a stricter target-based regime than already exists with the Kyoto Protocol."
- "We believe there is an educative role to be played by a more frank and open discussion of the economic issues involved in tackling climate change, and that the public deserves to be better informed about them. We do not believe, for example, that many people are aware that the international efforts made so far—The Framework Convention on Climate Change (1992) and its first Protocol, the Kyoto Protocol (negotiated in 1997 and brought into force in 2005)—will make little difference to future rates of warming, even if implemented in full."
- We can see no justification for an IPCC procedure which strikes us as opening the way for climate science and economics to be determined, at least in part, by political requirements rather than by the evidence. Sound science cannot emerge from an unsound process (para 111).
- We are concerned that there may be political interference in the nomination of scientists to the IPCC. Nominees' credentials should rest solely with their scientific

qualifications for the tasks involved (para 116).

[Return to the top](#) 

## ***INHOFE PRAISES PRESIDENT BUSH'S INTENTION TO NOMINATE H. DALE HALL AS U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE DIRECTOR***

Sen. Inhofe made the following comments today upon learning of President Bush's intention to nominate H. Dale Hall as the director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:

"As I said on the Senate floor last April, Dale Hall would make an excellent Director for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Since 2001, Dale has been serving as the Service's Southwest Regional Director in Albuquerque. He is a 27-year career veteran of the Service, and is knowledgeable in the principles of fisheries and wildlife management by way of education and experience. In 1986, he was honored as one of the Service's 10 most outstanding merit pay employees for the year. In 1996, he was presented with the Department of the Interior's Meritorious Service Award by then-Secretary Bruce Babbitt. He is an outstanding individual who has devoted his life to public service in both the U.S. Air Force overseas and the Fish and Wildlife Service. I am delighted the President has recognized the same strong qualities that I saw in him at our field hearing in Oklahoma on the Partnership for Fish and Wildlife in April."

[Return to the top](#) 

## ***EPA Nominations Hearing***

### **Marcus Peacock**

Nominated for Deputy Administrator at the United States Environmental Protection Agency

### **Susan P. Bodine**

Nominated for Assistant Administrator for the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response

### **Granta Y. Nakayama**

Nominated for Assistant Administrator for Enforcement and Compliance Assurance



(photo: EPW Committee)

[Return to the top](#) 

## ***IN THE NEWS...***

### **Split court upholds EPA decision not to regulate greenhouse gases**

#### **Greenwire**

Friday, July 15, 2005

Darren Samuelsohn, Greenwire senior reporter

The U.S. EPA was within its legal authority when it rejected a 1999 petition from environmentalists seeking federal regulation of greenhouse gases from new motor vehicles, a split federal appeals court panel said in a 2-1 ruling issued this morning.

The decision by the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia dismissed a lawsuit filed by 11 states and 14 environmental groups that sought to force the Bush administration to issue mandatory controls for carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions from new cars and trucks.

Judges A. Raymond Randolph and David Sentelle, appointees of former President George H.W. Bush, said EPA exercised ample discretion in 2001 when it denied what was then a three-year-old petition before the agency from the International



Center for Technology Assessment.

Randolph, who wrote the 15-page majority opinion, cited EPA language saying the agency had examined the evidence and denied the petition after a thorough review of the Clean Air Act, its legislative history, other congressional action and Supreme Court precedent.

"New motor vehicles are but one of many sources of greenhouse gas emissions," Randolph wrote. "Promulgating regulations under [the Clean Air Act] would 'result in an inefficient, piecemeal approach to the climate change issue.'"

The ruling, representing the highest judgment to date on the global warming issue from a U.S. court, offers three distinct legal views from the federal appellate panel. Sentelle said in a concurring opinion that states' and environmentalists' positions were not even ripe for review, while Clinton appointee David Tatel completely dissented. For that reason, the overall decision may be appealed by the states or environmentalists either to the entire circuit or even up to the Supreme Court. ...

Click [here](#) for the full text of the story (subscription required)

[Return to the top](#) 

## ***IN CASE YOU MISSED IT...***

### **Bush's unheralded energy triumph**

Thursday, July 14, 2005

Robert D. Novak

Overshadowed by the London terrorist attack and largely ignored by inattentive news media, the declaration on global warming at the G-8 summit of industrialized nations sounded far more like George W. Bush than Tony Blair and Jacques Chirac. Prime Minister Blair failed in his attempted coup at Gleneagles in Scotland to bring his close friend President Bush into conformity on the Kyoto protocol.

The British, French and Germans pushed hard for U.S. submission to binding carbon emission targets. To the amazement of the scientific community, Europe capitulated and backed away from immediate restraints on a growing American economy. Bush won agreement from the G-8 that the world should await further scientific conclusion rather than rush unwise decisions that could deflate economic growth and lose jobs.

Together with the rout of pro-Kyoto forces in the U.S. Senate two weeks ago, the outcome at Gleneagles constitutes a major energy triumph for Bush when he had seemed headed for defeat. The week before Gleneagles, the President displayed

the stubbornness that often confounds allies but is his greatest strength. In a speech at the Smithsonian, he said efforts to “oppose development and put the world on an energy diet” would condemn two billion people in the undeveloped world to poverty and disease. ...

Most surprising was what did get in the Gleneagles communiqué. It conceded that “uncertainties remain in our understanding of climate science,” rejecting the environmentalist dogma of “settled science” about global warming. The G-8 summit’s public conclusion in favor of stopping and slowing the growth of greenhouse gases “as the science justifies” lifts Bush’s language verbatim from 2002. ...

In the aftermath of the G-8, Blair did not emulate Chirac’s absurd claims of victory at Gleneagles and, in fact, had little to say publicly about global warming. Less than a month earlier on his visit to Washington, the British leader was preparing his last chance to get Bush’s reversal on Kyoto. Given Blair’s steadfast support of Bush on Iraq, the White House had to swallow its indignation that the prime minister was secretly lobbying U.S. senators.

Blair hoped that the Senate in late June would repudiate Bush on global warming for the first time, creating a momentum for Kyoto at the G-8 summit. Just the opposite occurred. The McCain-Lieberman bill actually lost ground; a nuclear energy provision added to attract conservatives lost four liberal Democratic senators. Sen. Pete Domenici, the Energy Committee chairman, withdrew support from an alternative proposal when a headcount showed 52 senators opposed. A non-binding resolution by Sen. John Kerry urging international negotiations on global warming had passed two years ago but was defeated this time.

All that passed in the Senate June 22 was a non-binding resolution, carried with 53 votes, that cautiously called for “market-based” limits on greenhouse gases that “will not significantly harm the United States economy.” For his first term and a half, Bush will have held the line against the global warming hysteria and even got his G-8 colleagues to go along with him.

Click [here](#) for the full text of the column.

---

Bill Holbrook, Communications Director  
Matt Dempsey, Deputy Press Secretary



# THE WEEK IN REVIEW...

## QUOTES OF THE WEEK...

1999:

“We will hear a lot of rhetoric about how much implementing mercury reduction steps will cost. In advance of those complaints I want to make two points. First, when we were debating controls for acid rain we heard a lot about the enormous cost of eliminating sulphur dioxide. But what we learned from the acid rain program is that when you give industry a financial incentive to clean up its act, they will find the cheapest way. ... Secondly, and most importantly, the bottom line here should not be the cost of controlling mercury emissions, but the cost of not controlling mercury.”

Senator Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.)  
Sponsor of S. J. Res. 20, Disapproving EPA's Clean Air Mercury Rule  
Congressional Record  
March 19, 1999

2005:

“The cap-and-trade system established under today's rule also creates incentives for continued development and testing of promising mercury control technologies that are efficient and effective, and that could later be used in other parts of the world. In addition, by making mercury emissions a tradable commodity, the system provides a strong motivation for some utilities to make early emission reductions and for continuous improvements in control technologies.”

EPA Press Release  
Implementation of the Clean Air Mercury Rule  
March 15, 2005

## ***INHOFE SAYS CAIR LAWSUIT DEMONSTRATES NEED FOR CLEAR SKIES LAW***

Sen. Inhofe said Tuesday that a lawsuit filed last week against the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) by North Carolina's Democrat attorney general, the Appalachian Mountain Club, Group Against Smog and Pollution, the National Parks Conservation Association and Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), is nothing more than the latest political move that will actually delay clean air progress. CAIR is intended to reduce air pollution from power plants in 28 Northeastern states and the District of Columbia.

“Time and again, these extreme special interests and their Democrat allies seem to be more focused on issuing political statements than improving our air quality,”

➤ [Inhofe Says  
CAIR  
Lawsuit  
Demonstrates  
Need For  
Clear Skies  
Law](#)

➤ [Bipartisan  
Water  
Infrastructure  
Bill  
Introduced](#)

➤ [A Climate  
Change  
Triple Play  
To End The  
Game?](#)

➤ [Inhofe  
Praises  
President  
Bush's  
Intention To  
Nominate H.  
Dale Hall As  
U.S. Fish  
And Wildlife  
Service  
Director](#)

➤ [EPA  
Nominations  
Hearings](#)

## IN THE NEWS...

➤ [Split court  
upholds  
EPA  
decision not  
to regulate  
greenhouse  
gases](#)

(Greenwire,  
July 15,  
2005)

## ***IN CASE YOU MISSED IT...***

➤ Bush's  
unheralded  
energy  
triumph  
(column by  
Robert D.  
Novak, July  
14, 2005)

Senator Inhofe said. "This latest round of litigation demonstrates the need for a strong national Clear Skies law more than ever. Trying to litigate the way to cleaner air only delays progress, often yields little or no result and wastes millions in taxpayer dollars. Our Clear Skies legislation would actually do far more to help state and local governments comply with the new air quality standards than the rule would. If these groups and their friends in Congress are serious about reducing air pollution, I welcome their endorsement of Clear Skies and its 70 percent cut in air pollution from the power plants nationwide. We have a workable proposal on the table, and given the rejection of mandatory caps on carbon dioxide by 60 senators and the recent failure of three key air-related lawsuits, there is no reason for my Democrat colleagues to continue their objections and obstructions. We should be able to go home this summer and tell our constituents that their air is going to become 70 percent healthier. I am still waiting for the opponents of Clear Skies to come to the table with a legislative counter offer to the multiple proposals Senator Voinovich and I have offered the Committee."

[Return to the top](#) 

## ***BIPARTISAN WATER INFRASTRUCTURE BILL INTRODUCED***

Sen. Inhofe, along with Sen. James Jeffords (I-Vt.), ranking member of the full committee, Sen. Lincoln Chafee (R-R.I.), chairman of the subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Water, and Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton (D-N.Y.), ranking member of the subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Water, yesterday introduced the "Water Infrastructure Financing Act," which will provide \$38 billion over five years to our nation's cities and municipalities to address aging water infrastructure and provide clean, healthy, safe, and secure water. The legislation updates and improves upon the Clean Water and Safe Drinking Water Revolving Loan Funds, provides targeted grant assistance, and includes incentives for innovative and non-traditional approaches to address water pollution.

Senators Inhofe, Jeffords, Chafee and Clinton released the following statements:

### **Sen. Inhofe, chairman of the EPW Committee**

"The federal government has imposed numerous expensive regulations on our cities and towns without providing sufficient funding to meet our obligations under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. I am pleased to be joined by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in offering bipartisan legislation to address the well-documented funding gap between what we as a nation currently spend and what we need to spend to meet these regulatory mandates and update aging infrastructure. The nation is on the verge of a crisis with its water and wastewater systems and action must be taken now."

### **Sen. Jeffords, ranking member of the EPW Committee**

"I am pleased with the bipartisan legislation we are introducing today to address our nation's water infrastructure needs. This bill represents a new awareness on the part of the federal government that our nation's water supply is becoming an increasingly precious resource. With this legislation we renew our commitment to the water systems of the nation and help states and local communities provide clean and safe water for our citizens for years to come."

**Sen. Chafee, chairman of the EPW Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Water**

"I am pleased to be introducing the bipartisan Water Infrastructure Financing Act with Chairman Inhofe and Senators Jeffords and Clinton. As our communities struggle to meet the rising costs of delivering clean, safe drinking water and wastewater services through aging delivery systems, this legislation will provide critical new authorized funding for water infrastructure. Further, the bill contains important new grant components for addressing today's more complex water issues, as well as resources for improving the health of watersheds, and reducing stormwater and combined sewer overflows entering waterbodies such as Narragansett Bay. I look forward to swift passage of this vital legislative package."

**Sen. Clinton, ranking member of the EPW Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Water**

"We know that the projected costs of water infrastructure will outstrip currently available funding sources by billions of dollars over the next twenty years. This bipartisan legislation will provide new funding to our cities and towns to help them clean up their lakes and streams and provide safe drinking water."

[Return to the top](#) 

## ***A CLIMATE CHANGE TRIPLE PLAY TO END THE GAME?***

### **MVPs: House of Lords, G-8 Leaders, DC Circuit Court**

In what could be called a triple play on climate change, the British House of Lords, G-8 Leaders, and the D.C. U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals made quick work of the failed approach by alarmists on climate change. These recent developments are the latest in a string of debilitating defeats against mandatory carbon caps and the Kyoto Protocol that should put alarmists and their liberal special interest allies on the disabled list - permanently.

Today, the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia [dismissed](#) a lawsuit that sought to force the Bush Administration to issue mandatory controls for carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions from new cars and trucks. Yet again the litigation strategy of Democrats and their liberal special interest allies,

while costing taxpayers, has failed.

Last week, the G-8 leaders, in their communiqué, supported the position of the Bush Administration and clearly moved away from any future Kyoto-like agreement. Their statement represented a key repudiation of the flawed treaty and its mandatory carbon caps, but importantly, also signaled their consensus that there are scientific uncertainties related to climate change: “While uncertainties remain in our understanding of climate science, we know enough to act now to put ourselves on a path to slow and, as the science justifies, stop and then reverse the growth of greenhouse gases.”

Also last week, the British House of Lords’ Economic Affairs Committee released its report, “[\*The Economics of Climate Change\*](#),” confirming the numerous uncertainties in climate change science and the problems associated with the work of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and problems with the Kyoto Protocol. They write:

- “The Kyoto Protocol is essentially a legal regime that attempts to punish short-term non-compliance but ... does so with an enforcement mechanism that is so weak it is likely to be counter-productive, i.e. it will encourage reduced participation in the future, not the widening participation that is required. At the moment, it is hard to see how countries will sign up to a stricter target-based regime than already exists with the Kyoto Protocol.”
- “We believe there is an educative role to be played by a more frank and open discussion of the economic issues involved in tackling climate change, and that the public deserves to be better informed about them. We do not believe, for example, that many people are aware that the international efforts made so far—The Framework Convention on Climate Change (1992) and its first Protocol, the Kyoto Protocol (negotiated in 1997 and brought into force in 2005)—will make little difference to future rates of warming, even if implemented in full.”
- We can see no justification for an IPCC procedure which strikes us as opening the way for climate science and economics to be determined, at least in part, by political requirements rather than by the evidence. Sound science cannot emerge from an unsound process (para 111).
- We are concerned that there may be political interference in the nomination of scientists to the IPCC. Nominees’ credentials should rest solely with their scientific qualifications for the tasks involved (para 116).

[Return to the top](#) 

***INHOFE PRAISES PRESIDENT BUSH’S INTENTION  
TO NOMINATE H. DALE HALL AS U.S. FISH AND***

## ***WILDLIFE SERVICE DIRECTOR***

Sen. Inhofe made the following comments today upon learning of President Bush's intention to nominate H. Dale Hall as the director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:

"As I said on the Senate floor last April, Dale Hall would make an excellent Director for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Since 2001, Dale has been serving as the Service's Southwest Regional Director in Albuquerque. He is a 27-year career veteran of the Service, and is knowledgeable in the principles of fisheries and wildlife management by way of education and experience. In 1986, he was honored as one of the Service's 10 most outstanding merit pay employees for the year. In 1996, he was presented with the Department of the Interior's Meritorious Service Award by then-Secretary Bruce Babbitt. He is an outstanding individual who has devoted his life to public service in both the U.S. Air Force overseas and the Fish and Wildlife Service. I am delighted the President has recognized the same strong qualities that I saw in him at our field hearing in Oklahoma on the Partnership for Fish and Wildlife in April."

[Return to the top](#) 

## ***EPA Nominations Hearing***

### **Marcus Peacock**

Nominated for Deputy Administrator at the United States Environmental Protection Agency

### **Susan P. Bodine**

Nominated for Assistant Administrator for the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response

### **Granta Y. Nakayama**

Nominated for Assistant Administrator for Enforcement and Compliance Assurance



(photo: EPW Committee)

[Return to the top](#) 

## ***IN THE NEWS...***

### **Split court upholds EPA decision not to regulate greenhouse gases**

#### **Greenwire**

Friday, July 15, 2005

Darren Samuelsohn, Greenwire senior reporter

The U.S. EPA was within its legal authority when it rejected a 1999 petition from environmentalists seeking federal regulation of greenhouse gases from new motor vehicles, a split federal appeals court panel said in a 2-1 ruling issued this morning.

The decision by the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia dismissed a lawsuit filed by 11 states and 14 environmental groups that sought to force the Bush administration to issue mandatory controls for carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions from new cars and trucks.

Judges A. Raymond Randolph and David Sentelle, appointees of former President George H.W. Bush, said EPA exercised ample discretion in 2001 when it denied what was then a three-year-old petition before the agency from the International

Center for Technology Assessment.

Randolph, who wrote the 15-page majority opinion, cited EPA language saying the agency had examined the evidence and denied the petition after a thorough review of the Clean Air Act, its legislative history, other congressional action and Supreme Court precedent.

"New motor vehicles are but one of many sources of greenhouse gas emissions," Randolph wrote. "Promulgating regulations under [the Clean Air Act] would 'result in an inefficient, piecemeal approach to the climate change issue.'"

The ruling, representing the highest judgment to date on the global warming issue from a U.S. court, offers three distinct legal views from the federal appellate panel. Sentelle said in a concurring opinion that states' and environmentalists' positions were not even ripe for review, while Clinton appointee David Tatel completely dissented. For that reason, the overall decision may be appealed by the states or environmentalists either to the entire circuit or even up to the Supreme Court. ...

Click [here](#) for the full text of the story (subscription required)

[Return to the top](#) 

## ***IN CASE YOU MISSED IT...***

### **Bush's unheralded energy triumph**

Thursday, July 14, 2005

Robert D. Novak

Overshadowed by the London terrorist attack and largely ignored by inattentive news media, the declaration on global warming at the G-8 summit of industrialized nations sounded far more like George W. Bush than Tony Blair and Jacques Chirac. Prime Minister Blair failed in his attempted coup at Gleneagles in Scotland to bring his close friend President Bush into conformity on the Kyoto protocol.

The British, French and Germans pushed hard for U.S. submission to binding carbon emission targets. To the amazement of the scientific community, Europe capitulated and backed away from immediate restraints on a growing American economy. Bush won agreement from the G-8 that the world should await further scientific conclusion rather than rush unwise decisions that could deflate economic growth and lose jobs.

Together with the rout of pro-Kyoto forces in the U.S. Senate two weeks ago, the outcome at Gleneagles constitutes a major energy triumph for Bush when he had seemed headed for defeat. The week before Gleneagles, the President displayed



the stubbornness that often confounds allies but is his greatest strength. In a speech at the Smithsonian, he said efforts to “oppose development and put the world on an energy diet” would condemn two billion people in the undeveloped world to poverty and disease. ...

Most surprising was what did get in the Gleneagles communiqué. It conceded that “uncertainties remain in our understanding of climate science,” rejecting the environmentalist dogma of “settled science” about global warming. The G-8 summit’s public conclusion in favor of stopping and slowing the growth of greenhouse gases “as the science justifies” lifts Bush’s language verbatim from 2002. ...

In the aftermath of the G-8, Blair did not emulate Chirac’s absurd claims of victory at Gleneagles and, in fact, had little to say publicly about global warming. Less than a month earlier on his visit to Washington, the British leader was preparing his last chance to get Bush’s reversal on Kyoto. Given Blair’s steadfast support of Bush on Iraq, the White House had to swallow its indignation that the prime minister was secretly lobbying U.S. senators.

Blair hoped that the Senate in late June would repudiate Bush on global warming for the first time, creating a momentum for Kyoto at the G-8 summit. Just the opposite occurred. The McCain-Lieberman bill actually lost ground; a nuclear energy provision added to attract conservatives lost four liberal Democratic senators. Sen. Pete Domenici, the Energy Committee chairman, withdrew support from an alternative proposal when a headcount showed 52 senators opposed. A non-binding resolution by Sen. John Kerry urging international negotiations on global warming had passed two years ago but was defeated this time.

All that passed in the Senate June 22 was a non-binding resolution, carried with 53 votes, that cautiously called for “market-based” limits on greenhouse gases that “will not significantly harm the United States economy.” For his first term and a half, Bush will have held the line against the global warming hysteria and even got his G-8 colleagues to go along with him.

Click [here](#) for the full text of the column.

---

Bill Holbrook, Communications Director  
Matt Dempsey, Deputy Press Secretary